DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 363 88 EA 008 003

TITLE	Project PRIMES: Progress Research in Meeting Elementary Standards. Project Termination Report.
INSTITUTION	Columbus Public Schools, Ohio. Dept. of Evaluation, Research, and Planning.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.; Ohio State Dept. of Education, Columbus. Div. of Research, Planning, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	31 Oct 75
NOTE	46p.; Related documents are ED 099 193 and ED 110 470-474
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Assessment; *Elementary Education; *Evaluation; *Evaluation Methods; Models; Needs Assessment; Objectives; Parochial Schools; Performance; Principals; Program Evaluation; State Legislation; *State Standards
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; ESEA Title III; Ohio (Columbus); *Project PRIMES

ABSTRACT

The purpose of Project PRIMES (progress research in meeting elementary standards) is three-fold: to design and test a model for evaluating elementary schools by state standards, to develop a set of evaluation instruments, and to aid teachers and administrators in the application and interpretation of evaluation procedures. The project's major objectives were to provide training assistance to schools by means of a field service unit, to establish a Building Evaluation Committee in each elementary school, to develop and pilot evaluation instruments to assess all nine areas of the state standards, and to document changes in attitudes toward and knowledge of evaluation procedures on the part of project participants. The evaluation strategy had three phases: documentation of all field activities as well as participating schools' followup activities, pre- and posttesting of teachers and principals as to knowledge of and attitudes toward evaluation, and external evaluation through the Auditing and Advisory Committee as to feasibility of implementing the model, instruments, and procedures on a statewide basis. A survey of affected principals found a highly positive response to the project's goals and objectives, direct services, type of evaluation plan, and evaluation instrument. (Author/IRT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED119363

Project Termination Report
for
Project PRIMES: Progress Research in Meeting Elementary Standards
ESEA, Title III

Prepared by:

The Staff of Project PRIMES
under the Supervision
of Cecil L. Martin, Project Director
and under the Direction
of Dr. Calvin Smith, Jr., Acting Director
Department of Evaluation, Research and Planning
Columbus Public Schools

Submitted to:

The Ohio Department of Education
Division of Planning and Evaluation
908 Ohio Departments Building
65 South Front Street
Columbus, Ohio

October 31, 1975

EA 008 003

PROJECT ABSTRACT

Primary Target Population	Number Served
Elementary principals, teachers and students in the Columbus Public and Diocesan Metropolitan Schools.	61,944

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION

The purpose of Project PRIMES is actually three-fold; to design and test a model for evaluation of elementary schools to meet state standards, to develop a set of evaluation instruments for meeting state standards, and to aid teachers and administrators in the application and interpretation of evaluation procedures.

MAJOR OBJECTIVES

1. To provide training assistance to schools by means of a field service unit.
2. To establish a Building Evaluation Committee in each elementary school to conduct evaluation.
3. To develop and pilot evaluation instruments to assess all nine areas of the state standards.
4. To document changes in attitudes toward and knowledge of evaluation procedures on the parts of project participants.

ACTIVITIES TO ACHIEVE OBJECTIVES

1. Planning activities: These would include the work of the Auditing Committee, Advisory Committee and the Field Service Unit to provide optimal services to participating schools.
2. Instrument development activities: This includes the designing and piloting of instruments to assess state standards.
3. Project completion activities: This includes final report writing, packaging procedures and instruments, and recommending future use of project materials based upon assessment standards.

EVALUATION STRATEGY

Phase I - Documentation of all field activities as well as participating schools' follow-up activities.

Phase II - Pre and post test teachers and principals as to knowledge of and attitudes toward evaluation.

Phase III - External evaluation through the Auditing and Advisory Committee as to feasibility of implementing the model, instruments, and procedures state-wide.

EVALUATION FINDINGS

A survey of Columbus Elementary principals (b[illegible] public and diocesan) resulted in the following findings:

1. The overall goals and objectives of Project PRIMES were rated as clear by 96% of the respondents*.
2. The direct services provided by the staff of the project were rated adequate by 98% of the principals.
3. The type of evaluation plan utilized by the project was rated useful by 90% of the respondents.
4. The PRIMES evaluation instruments were rated useful by 87% of the principals.

*93 principals responded to th[illegible] survey instrument.

BD-2-(b)

SECTION A. SUMMARY

Through the 1967 action of the Ohio 107th General Assembly which affected chartering of school districts, elementary schools became rightfully recognized for their contribution to the educational sequence of Ohio's youth. Prior to that time, official state approval of a school system had been based upon the quality of its secondary schools. This legislation, however, requires that elementary schools meet standards in order for a school district to be chartered. Certain standards pertain to the evaluation of program components.

In 1972, the Columbus Public School System was awarded an ESEA Title III grant to sponsor Project PRIMES (Progress Research in Meeting Elementary Standards). The purpose of the project was threefold:

1. To develop a model for the evaluation of elementary school programs in light of the Minimum Standards for Ohio Elementary Schools,

2. To develop a set of evaluation instruments for use at the local building level, and

3. To aid teachers and administrators in the application and interpretation of evaluation procedures.

The project ended its third and final year of operation on July 31, 1975.

An evaluation model has been developed and implemented in all 125 public and the 26 parochial elementary schools in the Columbus Metropolitan Area. Procedures for conducting the assessments have been established and principals have been trained in processes necessary to complete annual evaluations of school programs.

Evaluation instruments have been developed, field tested, and revised for use by elementary schools in assessing programs in light of state minimum standards.

A Field Service Unit assisted participating schools in the administration and interpretation of the evaluation instruments, summarized school by school findings, related school system information to system-level objectives and monitored progress. These services offered by this unit have been utilized and highly commended by professional staff personnel in both participating school systems.

The evaluation process served as a catalyst to program planning. As a result of the completed evaluations, schools carried out numerous post-evaluation activities which led toward program improvement.

To augment individual building efforts, project personnel planned and coordinated highly successful system-level workshops with building and central office administrators to remedy program weaknesses.

In light of these accomplishments, the project staff offers these recommendations for consideration:

Recommendations

Building Level

1. Each principal review the packaged model: Evaluating Elementary School Programs To Meet State Standards.
2. Each principal continue to assess the educational program annually.
3. Each principal document evaluation activities and have them on record for state inspection.

System Level

1. The Division of Instruction provides an annual in-service meeting during September-October dealing with the role of the principal in evaluating instructional programs.
2. The Department of Evaluation, Research and Planning produce and disseminate the packaged model: Evaluating Elementary School Programs To Meet State Standards for each elementary principal.
3. The Department of Evaluation, Research and Planning be charged with the task of monitoring the performance of elementary schools in meeting state standards.
4. The Division of Administrative Services utilize the data from local evaluations in preparing the Annual Principal's Opening Report and the State Department of Education ABSTRACT.

SECTION B. NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Under Section 3301.17 of the Ohio Revised Code, the legislature placed the responsibility for prescribing and adopting standards for Ohio elementary schools with the State Department of Education. The State Board set minimal standards for each elementary school with the hope that schools will achieve levels which exceed the minimum and develop innovative services that are responsive to the needs of the time.

While the legislature mandated standards for elementary schools and the State Board of Ohio provided minimal and Level II standards, little assistance, if any, was given to a public school system in implementing the evaluation of a building in order to meet the adopted standards. The development of evaluation assistance to help schools comply with state standards was the specific area of need addressed by Project PRIMES.

To determine what assistance was needed at the local level the elementary schools of Columbus, Ohio participated in Project 4-E (Evaluating Elementary Education Effectively). A variety of groups, from the individual building to the state level, were involved in the planning and implementation of the needs assessment process. Teachers, principals, supervising principals, supervisors, directors, executive directors, assistant superintendents and the superintendent (of the diocesan schools) were directly involved in the planning of the project.

Building Evaluation Committees were established in each elementary school to implement the needs assessment at the building level. The Building Evaluation Committee was composed of two teachers, two parents, the principal, students (optional) and others. The involvement of building personnel in addition to various central office administrative types from the public and parochial systems underlined the felt priority to develop evaluation assistance for elementary schools. In addition to the above groups, consultants from area universities were involved in the development of evaluation instruments. Also, representatives from the Ohio Department of Education were involved in the initial planning of the needs assessment and provided valuable consultation throughout the project.

A major impetus for the needs assessment was derived from comparing Ohio's situation with that of other states. Prior to the development of Project 4-E a survey of all state departments of education revealed the following information:

31 states have minimum standards for elementary education

28 directors of elementary education indicated a need for creating guidelines for schools to use in meeting state standards

30 states provided direct services (such as meeting with principals and discussing guidelines for the evaluator) in implementation of the standards

No state had any evidence of a plan developed by a school system which would effectively meet state standards.

The final report on the implementation of Project 4-E illustrated a need for evaluation assistance to elementary schools. Although some schools were previously engaged in some sort of self-evaluation, facilitating services in the areas of planning, designing, evaluating and reporting were needed. The data also indicated that, as a group, schools were generally not involved in various types of organized study. The following table illustrates:

Type of Activity	Used In Entire School	
	Yes	No
a) Action research	23	107
b) Experimentation	56	76
c) Self-evaluation	75	56
d) System-wide or university type of research	43	89

Weaknesses relative to other areas of the state standards were also indicated. 4-E data strongly indicated that elementary school libraries (83 schools) and media materials (96 schools) were not in compliance with standards.

The data also supported the notion that elementary schools needed to strengthen their individual school-community relations programs. Eighty-seven buildings felt that the effectiveness of their present program needed some improvement; 24 buildings felt their program needed much improvement.

In addition to the above results, it was found that the school system lacked an effective plan to involve parents and other community members in school planning. Although Project 4-E did involve parents to some degree, the need existed for a more effective mechanism to continue and increase community involvement.

SECTION C. DESCRIPTION OF THE LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY

The results of Project 4-E showed a definite inadequacy of human and financial resources in the Columbus Public School Systems to plan, administer, monitor, and evaluate school programs in order to meet elementary minimum standards. While some models of evaluation (Stufflebeam, Provus, Tyler, Stake, etc.) had made their appearances within the past few years, no one model has been effective in meeting the system's needs for elementary evaluation. This was especially true in an evaluation to determine if schools were meeting Level II standards.

Prior to the implementation of Project PRIMES an effective plan to implement any one of the criteria did not exist. In order to accomplish such changes, an evaluation unit had to be created to develop, administer, monitor evaluation activities, and report findings to targeted audiences.

The local education agency lacked mechanisms which were capable of producing models and instruments for diagnosing needs of schools and, at the same time, provide planning assistance for the implementation of educational improvements based on the evaluation findings. As was stated previously, the results of Project 4-E showed that there was a need to develop such a mechanism.

Project PRIMES (Progress Research in Meeting Elementary Standards) was designed to provide this mechanism for an evaluation system which could be used by any school system in the State of Ohio to comply with Level II standards.

SECTION D. PROJECT GOALS

The goals of Project PRIMES were as follows:

Goal 1.0 To design and test a model for evaluation of elementary schools to meet state standards.

Goal 2.0 To develop a set of evaluation instruments for meeting state minimum standards.

Goal 3.0 To determine changes in perceptions of project participants over the duration of the project.

SECTION E. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The narrative below follows the development of the project chronologically through its three-year tenure. Each chronological subdivision is organized around the discussion of the projects three goals with particular attention given to the general approaches and directions utilized to satisfy the stated educational needs. Justification for approaches implemented by the project staff are included as part of the discussion.

Year One -- School Year 1972-1973

The project staff included five professional and one full time clerk typist. Since elementary schools were the targeted audiences of the project, 3 teachers and one elementary principal were selected as staff members. Each was chosen on the basis of classroom success, and their knowledge and skill in evaluation and research procedures. The project director was a member of the Department of Evaluation, Research and Planning and had been the chief author of the original proposal submitted to Title III. Together, the staff formed a Field Service Unit which provided direct service to the 150 participating Columbus public and diocesan elementary schools.

The unit was housed in the Department of Evaluation, Research and Planning of the Columbus Public Schools and were afforded the availability to various support services such as xeroxing, system printing, telephone, utilities, and office space.

From the very beginning of the project, the three major goals of PRIMES shaped the activities of the Field Service Unit. First year efforts to reach these project goals follow.

Goal #1: To design and test a model for evaluation of elementary schools to meet state standards.

With the identified needs of the Columbus Public Schools already in mind, the staff set about the task of researching current evaluation models which might apply to the particular situation of the school system. Through this study, the following seven-stage evaluation model was tentatively designed to guide the work of the Field Service Unit:

Stage 1 - Establish Climate
Stage 2 - Plan the Evaluation
Stage 3 - Implement the Evaluation
Stage 4 - Monitor the Evaluation
Stage 5 - Obtain and Analyze the Data
Stage 6 - Report the Findings
Stage 7 - Document the Impact

Many of the models researched in the educational literature began with the "Planning Stage" and ended with a "Reporting Stage." The project staff felt that a model for evaluation needed to include provisions for the participants in the evaluation to establish certain conditions prior to the planning stage. This initial stage of the model included provisions as designating targeted audiences, deciding upon a common definition of evaluation, having background information about the Minimum Standards for Ohio Elementary Schools, initiating a variety of effective communication between and among participants and providing guidelines to ensure effective leadership in conducting meetings.

The project staff also felt that an evaluation need not necessarily end with reporting information to decision-makers. Action taken by decision-makers on the basis of the reported evaluation findings needed to be documented by the evaluation participants. As in the case of local school self-evaluations, the decision-makers would probably be the participants, themselves. Any action which they may decide to take would have to be documented in some form of action plan to alleviate identified weaknesses.

Following the precedent set by the 4-E Project, the Field Service Unit helped each school establish a Building Evaluation Committee with membership drawn from parents and teachers with the school principal serving as chairman of the committee. This committee was established in each school since the state standards suggested that evaluation be a cooperative process involving community members, teachers, principals, specialists, and other parties who could add input into the assessment.

To provide this help in establishing the evaluation committee, the project staff planned and sponsored a large group orientation session for all participating elementary principals in Columbus on August 30, 1972. In addition, the Field Service Unit provided an individual school briefing to each elementary principal during the initial months of the 1972-1973 school year. This was done to insure that each principal was knowledgeable about the evaluation model and procedures to be followed.

Goal #2:	To develop a set of evaluation instruments for meeting state standards.

A survey of contemporary evaluation instruments revealed the fact that there did not exist a set of instruments for assessing school programs in light of the state minimum standards.

Thus the project staff set about the task of designing a procedure for developing such a collection of instruments that would insure the involvement of curriculum and program experts, the school system's parents, teachers, and principals, and representative officials from the State Department of Education.

With these factors in mind, the project staff developed the PRIMES Network System for Instrument Development (PNS). This system called for several different types of activities as well as a wide range of expertise in elementary education. A diagram of the network system is included in Appendix A.

The PRIMES Network System began with the initial planning of the instrument, proceeded through the first, second, and final draft of the instrument and culminated in the printing and distribution of the instrument. However, two different sets of activities were also progressing which corresponded to the major events mentioned above.

Interfacing Activities were transpiring which included much dialogue with experts in the particular area which the instrument was to measure. These experts served on a Steering Committee and did so at no cost to the project. The actual list of people serving on the Steering Committees is quite long and does not appear in this report. However, all names are available from the Department of Evaluation, Research and Planning of the Columbus Public Schools.

Reaction committees were also established under the Interfacing Activities. These committees consisted of people who would be actually involved in implementing the evaluation instruments and the responsibilities of committee members included input as to content, format, and utility.

A second set of activities, developmental activities, were concerned with the mechanical or technical aspects of instrument construction. These activities included researching the standards, developing an item pool, indexing the items, matching items to proper response keys, piloting the instrument and revising the instrument as needed.

During the first year of the project, the following evaluation instruments were drafted, revised and piloted in both participating school districts:

The Overview Assessment Instrument
The Social Studies Evaluation
The Reading Evaluation Instrument
The Language Arts Evaluation Instrument
The Mathematics Evaluation Instrument
The Creative Arts Evaluation Instrument

Goal #3: To determine changes in perceptions of project participants over the duration of the project.

During the implementation stage of the first year of the project, principals found a need to call upon the services of the Field Service Unit to assist them in commencing the self-evaluations. A total of 165 briefing/training sessions were held the first year with just the building principals. 323 sessions were held with Building Evaluation Committees at which time PRIMES staff members assumed the initial leadership role. These statistics obviously decreased over the three-year tenure of the project as school leaders became more expert in the evaluation process.

Elementary principals were surveyed in year one as to their knowledge of and attitudes toward evaluation and the state minimum standards. The data indicated that principals felt a responsibility to see that their buildings meet state standards. However, the principals felt that evaluation should be a cooperative process involving staff, parents, and others and not be left solely to the principal to conduct assessments. The time required for evaluation was their main constraint.

Principals also reported that they were pleased with the PRIMES Model for evaluation (85% judged it useful) and were comfortable working with the procedures as outlined by the project staff.

Year Two -- 1973-1974

Goal #1: To design and test a model for evaluation of elementary schools to meet state standards.

During the second year of the project, the stages of the evaluation model became more definitive and the staff continued to relate collected date to the procedures and guidelines under each stage of the model.

At the conclusion of year one, 100% of the participating schools completed a self-evaluation of a program area in light of the state minimum standards. Year two also found that elementary schools were indeed implementing the evaluation model as evidenced by 97% of the schools completing a self-assessment.

The building principals and Building Evaluation Committees also showed more expertise in implementing the model. The number of evaluation sessions at which the Field Service Unit attended dropped from 323 to 219.

The reporting of evaluation information at the building level during the second year grew to be a priority for the building leadership. The Field Service Unit assisted or provided a summary evaluation report for 105 elementary schools during the second year of the project. During the first year, only 40 schools requested assistance in this area of evaluation.

Schools were active in designing a follow-up or action plan to their evaluation during the first two years of the project. The following chart summarizes the types of activity planned.

FOLLOW-THROUGH PLANS REPORTED BY
COLUMBUS ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

CATEGORY	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS PLANNING FOLLOW-THROUGH	
	1972-73*	1973-74**
MATERIALS, EQUIPMENT	25	33
REPORTING, DISSEMINATION	11	3
IN-SERVICE, STAFF DEVELOPMENT	34	37
PARENT INVOLVEMENT	11	11
INSTRUCTION, CURRICULUM	41	46
RESOURCE PERSONNEL	15	18
TESTING	6	3
GOALS, OBJECTIVES	5	14
PLANNING	9	0
CONTINUED EVALUATION	17	13
UNDETERMINED	13	8
TOTAL	187	186

*PLANS TO BE IMPLEMENTED BEGINNING IN 1973-74 SCHOOL YEAR.

**PLANS TO BE IMPLEMENTED BEGINNING IN 1974-75 SCHOOL YEAR.

Goal #2:	To develop a set of evaluation instruments for meeting state standards.

The PRIMES Network System for Instrument Development proved to be a useful tool for the project staff to utilize in developing evaluative tools. The following three instruments were developed, piloted and revised during the second year of the project:

1. Statutory Requirements and Organization and Administration Evaluation Instrument

2. Pupil Services Evaluation Instrument

3. Staff Personnel Evaluation Instrument

Two instruments developed in year one (reading and language arts) were combined into an evaluation tool called the Language Arts Evaluation Instrument since the standards as well as the Columbus Public School System both view spelling, reading, oral communication, etc. under the umbrella of the Language Arts.

Goal #3:	To determine changes in perceptions of project participants over the duration of the project.

The opinions of teachers were sampled at a January 2, 1974 workshop which featured Dr. Elliot Eisner as speaker. The names and address of the teachers sampled were recorded so that a post-assessment of the same teachers could occur during the final year of the project.

The data from the teachers' preassessment indicated the following:

1. Less than one-half of the teachers surveyed had read from the State Standards booklet published by the State Department of Education.

2. Only 30% of the teachers felt that the Level II standards provide good direction for school improvement.

3. Only 30% of the teachers felt that the state standards are realistic and have meaning for their schools.

4. 59% of the teachers reported that they had personally initiated curriculum evaluation activities in their classrooms.

These four pieces of data from the preassessment would show significant gains in the third year post assessment.

Year Three -- 1974-1975

Goal #1:	To design and test a model for evaluation of elementary schools to meet state standards.

Year three of the project witnessed a continuing high level acceptance of the evaluation model by participants. 90% of the schools participating completed their self-evaluations for the 1974-1975 school year. 145 elementary principals still requested an initial briefing with a member of the Field Service Unit but the Building Evaluation Committees across the two school districts only requested 192 sessions with the PRIMES consultants. This was an anticipated decrease of 131 sessions over year one.

Participating schools in year three of the project still requested the same types of assistance in report writing that they had requested in year two. In total, 106 reports were produced either by or for schools who wished to communicate evaluation findings.

The model developed through Project PRIMES has been packaged during this final year of the grant period. The format of the package follows the eight stage evaluation model. The stages of the model, as revised in this third year of operation, are as follows:

Stage 1 - Establishing Climate
Stage 2 - Planning the Evaluation
Stage 3 - Selecting/Designing Instruments
Stage 4 - Implementing the Evaluation
Stage 5 - Monitoring the Evaluation
Stage 6 - Analyzing the Data
Stage 7 - Reporting the Results
Stage 8 - Designing the Action Plan

The package contains all the instruments developed during the project tenure and can be found in the 3rd Stage of the Model. Definitions of each stage, guidelines to complete each stage and necessary support materials are organized into the evaluation package.

A copy of this package is included along with this PTR report.

Goal #2:	To develop a set of evaluation instruments for meeting state standards.

As was mentioned earlier, the complete set of instruments for assessing state standards is included in the 3rd stage of the evaluation package.

Year three saw the completion of the remaining three instruments for evaluating school programs in light of the state standards. The complete set now covers all nine areas of the standards and includes the following:

1. Overview Assessment Instrument
2. Statutory Requirements/Organization and Administration Instrument

Curriculum and Instruction Instruments for:

3. Language Arts Instrument
4. Creative Arts Instrument
5. Mathematics Instrument
6. Science Instrument
7. Social Studies Instrument
8. Pupil Services Instrument
9. Staff Personnel Instrument
10. Instructional Materials/Media Center Concepts Instrument
11. School/Community Relations Instrument
12. Evaluation and Research Instrument
13. Physical Facilities Instrument

The principal's post assessment data in May, 1975 indicated that 90% of the principals felt that the instruments were useful to them in evaluating school programs; this is in comparison to the 68% figure resulting from the pre-assessment survey in January of 1973.

Goal #3:	To determine changes in perceptions of project participants over the duration of the project.

During the third year of Project PRIMES, teachers, parents and principals in participating schools were surveyed as to their knowledge of and attitudes towards evaluation requirements specified in the state standards for elementary schools in Ohio.

The following statements have been generated from the data analyzed from the three surveys. Statements 1-5 are based on a pre-post evaluation design with statements 6 and 7 generated from a one-time survey of parents.

1. A greater percentage of Columbus elementary principals now feel that they have a responsibility to see that their buildings are meeting state standards.

2. A greater percentage of Columbus elementary principals feel that evaluation is usually worth the time and effort it asks of staff members.

3. The evaluation model as provided through Project PRIMES was judged useful by a higher percentage of elementary principals in the post assessment than in the pre-assessment.

4. A higher peccentage of Columbus elementary teachers now feel they have a responsibility to be aware of all state standards which apply to them and their building.

5. A higher percentage of Columbus elementary teachers now feel that most state standards are realistic and have meaning for their school.

6. Parents feel that elementary schools should be held responsible for meeting all Level I standards.

7. Parents feel that the school community should be involved in the evaluation of school programs.

A more detailed analysis of the data is included in Section F of this report.

Project PRIMES
Budget Analysis

Total Federal Support under ESEA Title III	$217,171.76
Total Federal Support other than ESEA Title III	0.00
Total Non-Federal Support	42,000.00*
Total Project Cost	$259,191.76

*Approximate

SECTION F. PROJECT OUTCOMES

In this section overlapping objectives or variations of the same objective from one year to another are listed once with the variations cited.

Performance Objective 1.0 1972-73

TO ENCOURAGE ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY BY LOCAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PERSONNEL AND LAY PERSONS FOR INITIATING AND CARRYING OUT EVALUATION PROCEDURES. This objective was revised somewhat for the second year: (Having participated in the training procedures presented by project staff, public and parochial elementary school principals, teachers and community members in Columbus will demonstrate increased acceptance for evaluation implementation at the local school level as evidenced by documentation of 25% increased: a) evaluation planned activity carried out at staff meetings, b) utilization of evaluation techniques and measures for collecting and disseminating information, and c) selection or identification of program objectives for more accurate diagnosis of educational and instructional needs in the participating schools from year one to year two.)

Facilitating Objective 1.1 1972-74

TO DESIGN, TEST, AND REVISE EVALUATION PROCEDURES. The concept of the Building Evaluation Committee provided the major impetus in achieving this objective. Composed of the building principal, teachers and parents, this committee's function was to plan, implement and monitor the local building evaluation activities. The evaluation model developed by the project provided the mechanism for conducting the local evaluation activities. A complete work breakdown of the model is shown in Appendix B.

Facilitating Objective 1.2 1972-74

TO DESIGN, TEST AND REVISE EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS. By the end of year three instruments were developed covering each of the nine manda'ed areas of the state standards in addition to an overview of the total standards. These instruments provided the materials with which the local school could implement the evaluation procedures outlined in the model.

Evaluation Instruments Developed

1. Overview Instrument
2. Organization and Administration Statutory Requirements
3. Social Stud es
4. Creative Arts
5. Language Arts
6. Mathematics
7. Science
8. Pupil Services
9. Staff Personnel
10. School-Community Relations
11. Instructional Materials
12. Physical Facilities
13. Evaluation and Research

Facilitating Objective 1.3 1972-74

TO DESIGN, TEST AND REVISE TRAINING PROCEDURES NECESSARY FOR INSTALLATION OF THE EVALUATION MODEL. A project field service unit was established to provide training and assistance to local buildings. An approach indicating the amount of evaluation assistance needed by the school was designated by each participating building. (See the following two charts)

THE SERVICES AVAILABLE TO SCHOOLS THROUGH THE
FOUR ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES OFFERED BY PRIMES

Approach	Types of Services Available
Approach I	1) Evaluation Specialist briefs the school principal as to evaluation procedures. 2) Specialist conducts orientation sessions for Building Evaluation Committee and school staff. 3) Specialist implements evaluation instruments at work sessions. 4) Specialist conducts consensus sessions and brings evaluation to closure.
Approach II	1) Evaluation Specialist briefs building principal as to evaluation procedures. 2) Specialist conducts orientation sessions for Building Evaluation Committee and school staff. 3) Specialist conducts consensus sessions and brings evaluation to closure.
Approach III	1) Evaluation Specialist briefs building principal as to evaluation procedures.
Approach IV	1) Building Principal conducts the evaluation using instrumentation and services from sources other than Project PRIMES.

Project PRIMES
School Approach Selections
1972-1975

	Total # of Schools	Approach I	Approach II	Approach III	Approach IV
Year One 1972-73	138	60 (43%)	29 (21%)	49 (36%)	*
Year Two 1973-1974	136	46 (34%)	31 (23%)	59 (43%)	*
Year Three** 1974-1975	114	32 (28%)	15 (13%)	63 (55%)	4 (4%)

*Approach IV Not an Option during Years One and Two
**As of May 12, 1975

Facilitating Objective 1.4 1972-73

TO DEVELOP A SYSTEM FOR MONITORING THE EVALUATION ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT BY THE LOCAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. The project field service unit provided a source of external monitoring. This unit assisted in the scheduling of evaluation activities for buildings needing service and also assisted in the implementation of those activities, noting modifications that were necessary. The Building Evaluation Committee provided a source of internal monitoring by coordinating the on-site evaluation activities and instituting changes as needed. (See Appendix C).

Facilitating Objective 1.5 1974-75

TO AID INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS IN IMPLEMENTING THE EVALUATION MODEL FOR MEETING STATE STANDARDS. The field service unit continued to provide assistance to the local building as needed based upon the perceptions of the local evaluation participants.

TABLE I

LONGITUDINAL DATA DEPICTING
THE NUMBER OF SESSIONS HELD WITH
COLUMBUS ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS TO
GIVE ASSISTANCE IN INTERPRETATION
AND ADMINISTRATION OF EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

Project Year	Number of Sessions Held
1972-1973	323
1973-1974	219
1974-1975	168

TABLE II

LONGITUDINAL DATA DEPICTING
TRAINING/BRIEFING SESSIONS
HELD WITH COLUMBUS ELEMENTARY
PRINCIPALS TO ASSIST IN IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES

Project Year	Number of Briefing/Training Sessions Held with Principals
1972-1973	165
1973-1974	141
1974-1975	145

Facilitating Objective 1.6 1974-75

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS AND COMMUNITY PARTICIPANTS WILL IMPLEMENT THE EVALUATION MODEL. The Building Evaluation Committee continued to function as the coordinating agent at the building level. EVALUATION DESIGN: Information concerning the level of acceptance of evaluation implementation on the part of principals, teachers and parents is to be acquired by project staff through documented records maintained throughout the project.

Comparisons of year one and year two figures, as shown in Table III, indicated that the 25% performance level was not met in every instance. However, it is felt by the project staff that such a performance level

was unrealistic due to the high level of participation of year one and year two schools in the project. It should be noted, however, that a 26% increase in training or briefing sessions was evidenced from year one to year two. Also significant was the fact that a 38% increase of the schools surveyed their school communities in an effort to expand parent input.

TABLE III

DOCUMENTATION:
ACCEPTANCE OF EVALUATION RESPONSIBILITY BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

	1972-73 N=145 Schools	1973-74 N=146 Schools	Percent of Increase or Decrease
A. Recorded Evaluation Implementation Activities of Participants:			
1. Number of school principals who participated in a briefing session with PRIMES consultants in order to discuss the evaluation model, procedures and activities.	113	142	+26%
2. Number of school staffs who took part in an orientation session with PRIMES consultants to discuss and plan evaluation activities.	100	57	-43%
3. Number of school Building Evaluation Committees who coordinated the collection of input from teachers, parents, principals, and often times, students.	105	110	+ 5%
4. Number of schools whose teachers completed the PRIMES self-assessment instruments.	128	129	+ 1%
5. Number of schools whose parents completed the parent opinion sections of PRIMES evaluation instruments.	101	91	-10%
B. Utilization of evaluation techniques:			
1. Number of schools who conducted and completed needs assessments.	128	129	+ 1%
2. Number of schools who surveyed their school community through the use of opinionnaires.	66	91	+38%

	1972-73 N=145 Schools	1973-74 N=146 Schools	Percent of Increase or Decrease
3. Number of schools who completed analysis of standardized scores to augment PRIMES evaluation.	2	6	+
4. Number of schools who conducted Attitudinal Surveys of students.	1	2	+
5. Number of schools who developed and administered skill tests/checklists in addition to the PRIMES needs assessment.	1	4	+
C. Number of schools who have documented the use of various reporting techniques in disseminating evaluation results to the staff and school community:	84	28	-67%

	Percent of responding schools using dissemination techniques in year #1.	Percent of responding schools using dissemination techniques in year #2	Percent of increase (+) or decrease (-).
1. Insert in school newsletters	38%	46%	+8%
2. Insert in community newsletters	6%	7%	+1%
3. Special Printed Handout	13%	18%	+5%
4. Special Meeting to report results	12%	4%	-8%
5. Report at PTA meeting	23%	18%	-5%
6. Faculty meeting	61%	86%	+25%
7. Workshops on results with faculty or community	12%	21%	+9%
8. Small group discussion	24%	46%	+22%
9. No reporting is anticipated	4%	4%	0
D. Number of schools who have identified and selected program objectives for more accurate diagnosis of educational and instructional needs.	47 schools	14 schools	-70%

Performance Objective 2.0 1973-74

TO INCREASE LEADERSHIP FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF EVALUATION GUIDELINES. Having participated in project staff training procedures, leadership for implementation of evaluation guidelines will be increased at the building level through the efforts of participants as demonstrated by more standards being met following project activities as indicated by comparision of pre-post results of the 4-E (PRIMES Overview) Instrument which contains items concerning the nine mandated educational areas. The Overview Instrument will be administered in all the participating schools during the 1971-72 school year and will be administered in 1975 to a 20% (revised in 1974 to 10%) sample of the total participating schools.

EVALUATION DESIGN: Any change in the number of standards being met at the local building level on the part of principals will be determined by project staff through implementing the Overview Instrument on a pre-post test basis. (The design was revised in 1974 to include only items from Section VIII, Evaluation and Research.)

Pre-test information obtained in 1972 from the Overview Instrument showed that, in the area of Evaluation and Research, some elementary schools (75) were previously engaged in some sort of self-evaluation on a building level as mandated by state minimum standards. However, these attempts needed facilitating services in the areas of planning, designing, evaluating and reporting the research. During the span of Project PRIMES, elementary schools were engaged in evaluating one aspect of the school program using the procedures developed by the project. Data generated from these studies of specific areas involved the self-evaluation procedures outlined in the standards. The original design of the objective was faulty in that it obligated at least a sample of the participating schools to conduct dual assessments during one school year. Project staff felt that, once a building had completed an in-depth self-evaluation study, it was unrealistic to ask that building to assess itself again relative to evaluation and research standards being met.

Also, valuable time was lost during the unanticipated teacher strike in the Columbus schools in January. In light of the strained atmosphere in elementary buildings following the strike settlement, project staff placed a higher priority on assisting schools to complete the regular program evaluation. It was felt that asking schools to complete the Overview post-assessment would work to the disadvantage of all concerned.

This performance objective, however, will be met by January of 1976 and the data will be made available to Title III and other interested parties. All Columbus Public Elementary Schools will be taking part in an overall assessment of the total school program in light of the State Minimum Standards during the fall months of 1975. The resulting data will be collected, compiled, and reported to decision makers within the Columbus school system. The data will also be compared to the data generated from the 1971-1972 Project 4-E survey.

Performance Objective 3.0 1973-74

TO DEMONSTRATE IMPROVEMENT IN ATTITUDE AND KNOWLEDGE AMONG PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS AND PARENTS. Having participated in the evaluation training procedures in conjunction with project staff, the public and parochial elementary school principal, teacher and parent participants in Columbus will deomonstrate improvement in their attitude toward and understanding of evaluation requirements specified in state standards for elementary schools. Improvement will be indicated by a 10% increase in positive responses to items on a project-developed evaluation survey.

This objective was revised into two separate objective and rescheduled for the third project year. The first objective was the same for the target audience of principals and teachers. The second objective was for the target audience of parents and stipulated a post-test only design in which 70% of a sample would respond positively to survey items dealing only with parental attitudes and knowledge of state standards.

EVALUATION DESIGN: Attituded toward and understanding of evaluation requirements and state standards on the part of principals, teacher and parents will be determined by project staff on a pre-post test basis through a project developed evaluation survey. All elementary principals were surveyed; teachers who attended a Columbus Education Association co-sponsored meeting were surveyed; and all parents recorded on Building Evaluation Committee rosters were surveyed.

Data from principals, shown in Table IV, indicated that the performance level of the objective was not reached for each item on the survey. However, pre-test data showed that initially high percentages of principals were responding positively to the survey. For this reason it was more difficult to observe an increase of the magnitude specified in the objective for each item. Two specific items, which capture the intent of the survey, should be cited. There was a 14% increase in positive responses (from 78% to 92%) that evaluation is worth the time and effort required of staff members. There was a 26% increase in positive responses (from 70% to 96%) that building principals have a responsibility to see that the building compiles with standards.

TABLE IV

PRE-POST ASSESSMENT DATA FOR ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS

	Percent of Positive Responses		
	Pre-Assessment N=80	Post-Assessment N=86	Increase
1. The building principal is responsible for choosing the program to be evaluated.	29%	35%	6%
*2. Evaluation of the school program should be conducted by the buildingpprincipal.	69%	75%	6%
3. Most principals have adequate time to conduct an evaluation of programs operating in their school.	15%	23%	8%
*4. Curriculum evaluation should primarily focus on the results obtained from standardized achievement scores.	91%	83%	-8%
5. Evaluation should be an on-going process.	94%	100%	6%
6. Information derived from a program evaluation should be a significant aspect of curriculum improvement.	98%	94%	-4%
*7. The office of evaluation is responsible for defining and conducting the assessment of program at the building level.	51%	62%	11%
*8. Evaluation can not really deal with the important goals in education.	86%	80%	-6%
9. Evaluation should be a cooperative process involving all members of the educational community e.g., (staff, parents, students, etc.).	88%	86%	-2%
10. Evaluation is already an integral part of your school program.	90%	92%	2%
11. Evaluation is usually worth the time and effort it asks of staff members.	78%	92%	14%**
12. Program evaluation is relevant only to the extent to which it effects programs in the classroom.	79%	75%	-4%

	Percent of Positive Responses		
	Pre-Asessment N=80	Post-Assessment N=86	Increase
13. Most state standards are realistic and have meaning for my school.	76%	75%	-1%
14. Building principals have a responsibility to see that their building meets state standards.	70%	96%	26%**

*Indicates a negative item - percentage refers to number who disagreed with the negative statement.

**Performance level met or exceeded.

Data from teachers, shown in Table V, also indicated that the performance level was not reached for each item. Although some pre-test data showed initial high percentages of positive responses, the trend was not as consistent as with the principal data. It would appear that the general attitudes and knowledge of teachers toward evaluation and standards do not emerge as strongly as with principals. This is perhaps related to the lesser intensity of involvement of teachers as compared to principals. However, several specific increases can be noted. There was a 12% increase in positive responses that state standards have value for classroom teachers. There was a 27% increase in positive responses that Level II standards provide good direction for school improvement. Also, there was a 33% increase in positive responses that teachers have read sections of the standards.

TABLE V

PRE-POST ASSESSMENT DATA
FOR
ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

N=23	Percent of Positive Responses		
	Pre-Assessment	Post-Assessment	Increase
1. Most elementary teachers possess an adequate knowledge of evaluation techniques to assess building programs.	45%	44%	-1%
2. It is the responsibility of the building principal to provide leadership in evaluating building programs.	84%	91%	7%
3. Most elementary school staffs have adequate time to conduct program evaluations.	18%	9%	-9%
4. To be effective, evaluation should be an on-going process.	95%	92%	-3%
*5. Ohio State Standards for Elementary Schools have little value for the classroom teachers.	40%	52%	12%**
6. The classroom teachers should be involved in the selection of the curriculum area to be evaluated.	93%	91%	-2%
7. The evaluations you have been involved with have led to curriculum improvement.	46%	48%	2%

		Percent of Positive Responses		
		Pre-Assessment	Post-Assessment	Increase
8.	If an evaluation is to be effective, parents must be involved in the process.	75%	69	-6%
*9.	Standardized testing is the best method for evaluating a curriculum area.	80%	78%	-2%
*10.	Evaluations conducted in your building are most useful for making system-wide decisions.	55%	39%	-16%
*11.	Most building evaluations are conducted only for the purpose of meeting state standards.	29%	35%	6%
12.	Teachers have a responsibility to be aware of all state standards which apply to them and their school program.	84%	87%	3%
*13.	If a curriculum evaluation is to be effective, it should be conducted by someone from outside the local building.	80%	79%	-1%
14.	Level II standards, e.g., those written at the optimal level, provide good direction for school improvement.	30%	57%	27%**
15.	I have read some sections of Ohio's Elementary School Standards.	46%	79%	33%**
*16.	Evaluation cannot really deal with the important goals in education.	79%	78%	-1%
17.	I have personally initiated curriculum evaluation activities in my classroom.	59%	79%	20%**
18.	Most state standards are realistic and have meaning for my school.	30%	44%	14%**

* Indicates a negative item - percentage refers to number who disagreed with the negative statement.

** Performance level met or exceeded.

Data from parents, shown in Table VI, indicated that, again, the performance level of the objective was not reached for each item. However, the data exceeded the performance level for approximately half of the items.

TABLE VI

ASSESSMENT DATA
FOR PARENTS

		Percent of Positive Responses N=23
1.	Evaluating building level school programs in order to meet state standards is an important activity.	96%**
2.	The school community should be involved in the evaluation of school programs.	100%**
3.	The local school maintains good communication with parents regarding evaluation efforts relative to state standards.	30%
*4.	Ohio State Standards for elementary schools have little value for parents.	74%**
5.	The local school has helped me in becoming aware of state standards.	43%
6.	I have seen a copy of Ohio's Elementary School Standards.	22%
7.	I have read some sections of the standards.	26%
8.	I feel that I understand the state standards.	26%
9.	The overall goals and objectives of Project PRIMES are clear to me.	35%
10.	Elementary schools should be held responsible for meeting all Level I Standards, the basic minimum.	78%**
11.	Level II Standards, e.g., those written at the maximum level, provide good direction for school improvement.	61%**
12.	Most state standards are realistic and have meaning for my school community.	57%**
13.	Parents have a responsibility to be aware of all state standards which apply to the school program of their children.	87%**
14.	The local school has helped me in trying to interpret specific standards.	43%

	Percent of Positive Responses N=23
15. Each curriculum area of the elementary school should be studied and revised regularly.	91%**
16. The building principal should provide leadership in evaluating building programs relative to state standards.	83%**
17. Parents should help choose the area to be evaluated at the building level.	70%**
18. If an evaluation is to be effective, parents must be involved in the process.	91%**
19. School program evaluations I have been involved with have led to curriculum improvements.	43%
20. Self-evaluation is a workable way to study local school programs.	78%**

* Indicates negative item - percentage refers to number who disagreed with the negative statement.

** Performance level met or exceeded.

Performance Objective 4.0 1974-75

TO PROVIDE EVIDENCE OF IMPACT OF EVALUATION ACTIVITIES. Participating elementary schools will provide evidences of the impact of the evaluation at the building level as part of the implementation of the evaluation model for meeting state standards. Schools will develop follow-up activities for program improvement based on the evaluation data collected. Participating schools will follow the suggested reporting procedures for disseminating evaluation results to the school community. Assessment will be based on documentation from 70% of the participating schools of follow-up activities and documentation of reporting procedures from the Reporting Checklist.

EVALUATION DESIGN: Evidences of the impact of evaluation at the building level will be acquired by project staff through project documentation records at the end of year three.

The attainment of this objective exceeded the performance level specified. Data gathered from the Ohio Department of Education 1974-75 ABSTRACT indicated that, among the 115 participating schools, 100 (87%) indicated some kind of follow-up intentions for program improvement. The Reporting Checklist was not used. However, similar data was collected from participating public schools on the aforementioned ABSTRACT. One hundred and one (88%) indicated that evaluation results were reported and/or disseminated by a variety of methods.

The following tables summarize post-evaluation activities of Columbus elementary schools over the three-year tenure of the project. Categories used in the tables are described below:

A. Materials and equipment - the purchase of, development of, distribution of or allocation of funds for materials and/or equipment to be utilized in the instruction of children.

B. In-service and staff development - organized professional growth experiences provided for any or all local building staff.

C. Parent involvement - continued or increased utilization of parents to provide assistance in evaluation efforts, instructional activities and home-school communications.

D. Instruction - the establishment or continuation of educational practices shown to enhance the instructional process.

E. Resource personnel - the use of non-school personnel, as well as school personnel (local building, central office, etc.) to provide materials and/or consultation for the local building staff in the instruction of children, staff development activities, school-community relations, etc.

F. Testing - the utilization of results from standardized or non-standardized (criterion references, teacher constructed, etc.) testing programs to assist in the instruction of children.

G. Objectives - the development, utilization or study of building level program objectives and/or instructional objectives relevant to individual students.

H. Continued evaluation - additional study of the program component into the next school year.

I. Teacher effectiveness - the increased level of knowledge, skill and/or awareness on the part of the instructional staff.

J. Communication - the enhancement of closer cooperation and communication among staff members to provide for a more interrelated program.

K. Home-school relations - the improvement of parent understanding and awareness of program components.

L. None specific - a general statement of improvement concerning a specific program studied.

M. Other - includes expanded use of available services, more efficient departmentalized program, classroom/time management, improved custodial services, review of school philosophy, increased student appreciation, and program reorganization.

N. Undetermined

Subsumed under these categories are specific intended program improvements organized according to the component under study. Table VII presents the frequency of occurrence of intended improvements reported by Columbus Elementary Schools for the 1974-1975 school year.

Several observations are indicated from the information in Table VII.

1. Of the 107 participating schools included in this report only four have not determined any program improvements that are likely to be made. This accounts for only 4% of the schools, a minimal percentage.

2. The most frequently cited areas of planned improvement across all components studied are in the categories of instruction and materials and equipment. These two categories alone comprise about one third of all the intended improvements reported.

3. There emerges a wider variety of anticipated program improvements when compared to the two previous project years. Expanding evaluation materials beyond the major curriculum areas to include three additional areas of program evaluation probably accounts for part of this finding.

4. As in the past, nearly half of the improvements reported in the category of instruction originate from schools evaluating reading/language arts. The specific improvements cited by the 39 schools involve a number of activities relating to grouping and placement of students in the Houghton-Mifflin Individualized Reading Program.

Table VIII summarizes follow-up activities of Columbus Public Elementary Schools during the period beginning in 1972 and ending in 1975.

TABLE VII

SUMMARY OF INTENDED PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS* REPORTED BY COMPONENT AREA FOR COLUMBUS ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS --1974-1975

	COMPONENT STUDIED									
	Creative Arts	Language Arts	Math	Science	Social Studies	Pupil Services	Statutory Requirements	School/ Community Relations	Special	Total
Materials and equipment	1	6	8	5	4					24
In-service and staff development	1	2	4	2	4	1		1		15
Parent involvement		1			2			4	2	9
Instruction	1	15	8	4	3				2	33
Resource Personnel			1	2	1	1				5
Testing	1	1	2							4
Objectives	1	1	3	2			1			8
Continued evaluation		2	2							4
Teacher effectiveness		8	2	1	1			1		13
Communication		3	1		1		1	1		7
Home-School Relations	2	7	2					7		18
None Specific	4	8	3		1	2		1		19
Other	1	4	1	1			1			8
Undertermined		2			1				1	4
TOTAL	12	60	37	17	18	4	3	15	5	171

*The cumulative frequency will not equal the number of schools involved since schools usually reported multiple followpthrough plans.

TABLE VIII

FOLLOW-THROUGH PLANS REPORTED BY COLUMBUS ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
OVER THE 3-YEAR TENURE OF THE PROJECT

CATEGORY	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS PLANNING FOLLOW-THROUGH		
	1973-73*	1973-74**	1974-75***
MATERIALS, EQUIPMENT	25	33	24
REPORTING, DISSEMINATION	11	3	7
IN-SERVICE, STAFF DEVELOPMENT	34	37	15
PARENT INVOLVEMENT	11	11	9
INSTRUCTION, CURRICULUM	41	46	33
RESOURCE PERSONNEL	15	18	5
TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS	0	0	13
TESTING	6	3	4
GOALS, OBJECTIVES	5	14	8
HOME-SCHOOL RELATIONS	0	0	18
PLANNING	9	0	0
CONTINUED EVALUATION	17	13	4
NONE SPECIFIC	0	0	19
UNDETERMINED	13	8	4
OTHER	0	0	8
TOTAL	187	186	171

*Plans to be implemented beginning in 1973-74 school year.
**Plans to be implemented beginning in 1974-75 school year.
***Plans to be implemented beginning in 1975-76 school year.

Auditing Committee for Project PRIMES

An auditing committee was established for Project PRIMES in 1973 for the purpose of judging the feasibility of implementing PRIMES materials and processes state-wide. Membership on the committee was as follows:

Virginia Kunkle, State Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio
Howard Troutner, Ohio Education Association, Columbus, Ohio
Neal Greenfield, Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc., Columbus, Ohio
Dr. Edward Jirik, Ohio Education Association, Columbus, Ohio
Jack Augustine, Superintendent of Schools, Youngstown, Ohio
Harriet Levine, Board Member, Springfield, Ohio
Dr. Joseph Davis, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Columbus, Ohio
Sr. Lucille Massey, Columbus Diocesan Schools, Columbus, Ohio
L. W. Huber, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Columbus, Ohio
Emmet Riley, Local Superintendent of Schools, Lima, Ohio
Janet Gottwold, Elementary Supervisor, Sandusky, Ohio
Robert Kabat, Principal, Maumee, Ohio

Several members on the committee felt that they could best judge feasibility by implementing the PRIMES model in their own school or school system. Thus, Project PRIMES staff members were invited to schools in Lima, Sandusky, Youngstown, Maumee, and Springfield in order to implement self-study evaluation.

During the 1973-74 and the 1974-1975 project years, the auditing committee judged the PRIMES model as being adaptable to other school systems in Ohio.

Specific questions were also asked of the auditing committee members during the 1974-1975 project year concerning the effectiveness of the evaluation instruments, the evaluation procedure and the field service unit concept. This data, along with several letters of correspondence, are presented in Appendix E of this report.

SECTION G. DISSEMINATION

The dissemination of information to decision-makers was a high priority of Project PRIMES. The purpose of the dissemination plan was to provide all decision-makers (administrators, principals, teachers, consultants, parents, students, others) with various means and methods for making alternative judgments.

The dissemination objectives for the three-year tenure of the project did not vary appreciatively from year to year. Due to time, budget and system level constraints, some of the objectives had to be altered or dropped.

The following chart summarizes the fourteen objectives written for the project and delineates those which were met or not met during each year of the project. A check (✓) in any cell indicates that the objective was written and in effect for the project year. A plus symbol (+) indicates that the objective was attained and a minus (-) symbol indicates that the objective was not met.

Key: (✓) Objective was written and [illegible]fect for the project year
(+) Objective was attained
(-) Objective was not met

Dissemination Objectives	Project Year One 1972-1973	Project Year Two 1973-1974	Project Year Three 1974-1975
1) The project disseminator in conjunction with the project supervisor, a local commercial artist, and consultants from local printing firms will design a three color brochure to disseminate project information. The brochure must be attractive, brief, and contain general information about Project PRIMES useful to teachers, principals, parents, and other audiences outside the city of Columbus.		✓-	✓+
2) The project staff will write and distribute quarterly newsletter reports on the progress of Columbus elementary public and Diocesan schools in meeting the state minimum standards of Ohio.	✓+	✓+	✓+
3) The project staff in conjunction with the Department of Public Information, Columbus Public Schools, will develop a slide-tape presentation to instruct and orientate the Building Evaluation Committee at each elementary school.	✓+	✓+	✓+
4) To build participation at National Educational Meetings into dissemination process.	✓+	✓+	✓+
5) The project staff will prepare and present an audio-visual presentation to the Columbus Public and Diocesan elementary teachers during the month of October, 1973.		✓+	
6) The project staff will prepare and present an audio-visual progress report to the Columbus Board of Education on the status of the Columbus elementary schools in meeting the state minimum standards of Ohio.	✓-	✓+	✓-
7) The project staff will write and distribute monthly progress reports to the state department of education, PRIMES Advisory Committee, and the Columbus Public and Diocesan Elementary Schools in meeting the state minimum standards.			✓+

Dissemination Objectives	Project Year One 1972-1973	Project Year Two 1973-1974	Project Year Three 1974-1975
8) The project staff will write and distribute an annual report on the status of Columbus Public and Diocesan Elementary Schools in meeting the state minimum standards of Ohio.	✓+	✓+	✓+
9) To make available a slide-cassette presentation to be used as a report to the community for PTA meetings, survey meetings or other invitational meetings.	✓+	✓+	✓+
10) The Project PRIMES staff will prepare and present an orientation session to the Columbus Public and Diocesan Administrative Staffs.	✓+	✓+	✓+
11) To make an eight-ten minute color movie which will serve as an orientation for evaluating elementary education.	✓-		
12) To create a Regional Evaluation Council which will provide forums for public discussion during the monitoring process of the project.	✓-		
13) To encourage exposure to radio and television.	✓+	✓+	
14) Subject to the approval of the Superintendent of the Columbus Public Schools, the project supervisor and four evaluation specialists will secure an invitation to make a presentation and conduct a workshop at the 1973-74 Associates for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) to be held at Anaheim, California.		✓-	

One very successful means of disseminating information to our participants was through the use of information packets. The project staff planned, produced and distributed such packets on the following occasions during the three-year tenure of the project:

August 30, 1972 - 220 packets organized and distributed to public and diocesan principals at meetings at Ramada Inn North. Orientation and implementation information was included.

November 17, 1972 - 30 packets organized and distributed to members of Project PRIMES Advisory Committee; evaluation and progress data included.

January 24 and 25, 1973 - Dr. Jack Rand Conference on Differentiated Staffing. 200 packets prepared for Elementary Principals for presentation at Ohio Historical Society.

350 programs were prepared for the audiences served:

Department of Teacher Personnel
Superintendent and Cabinet
Administrative Staff
Columbs and Diocesan Elementary Principals
Columbus Education Association

April 13, 1973 - 30 packets of information compiled for Project PRIMES Auditing Committee. Package contained instruments used for evaluation for 1972-73 project year as well as information useful in judging feasibility of implementing the Project PRIMES model statewide.

May 14, 1973 - 60 packets for scheduling workshop.

October, 1973 - 150 packets were prepared for the orientation sessions held for Columbus elementary principals. Items in the packets included:

Evaluation procedures
Evaluation instruments
Implementation guidelines
Sampling techniques

October, 1973 - Diocesan Principal's Orientation, 60 packets prepared.

A second approach which proved successful was the project's newsletter. A mailing list was developed which listed addresses and telephone numbers of prominent decision-makers in the school system and Columbus community. Each person on the mailing list received the newsletter and the mailing list was continuously updated and expanded.

Copies of the newsletters and other project publications are included in the appendices of this report.

A third approach, and probably the most effective media for disseminating information, was the interfacing of project staff with our targeted audiences. The concept of the Field Service Unit provided the opportunity to discuss and report various aspects of the project with teachers, parents, principals, and other participants involved in the building evaluations. This form of direct, person to person communication enabled each of the 151 elementary schools to become more aware of evaluation procedures and the Minimum Standards for Ohio Elementary Schools.

Other dissemination which should be mentioned in this report are listed below:

1) PRIMES presentation to the Columbus Public School's Committees of the Whole on November 20, 1972. The presentation was broadcast on Radio Station WCBE.

2) PRIMES staff was interviewed by Mr. Richard Coldren on December, 1972 on Radio Station WCBE. The program was broadcast on WMNI on December 17, 1972.

3) A presentation to the Diocesan Board of Education was made in October of 1973.

4) Five articles were written by the project staff for publication in state and national education journals. To date, one of the articles has been published in the Ohio Association of Elementary School Principals' Journal.

5) Representatives of four different school systems in Ohio have requested the services of the project staff in orienting teachers, parents, and principals to the objectives of Project PRIMES. Schools in the cities of Lima, Springfield, Sandusky and Youngstown have received such orientations, and all four of these audiences have implemented certain aspects of the procedures and instruments developed by the project staff.

6) Project information was disseminated to a large audience of public and parochial elementary teachers, principals and library aides at a May 1, 1975 workshop on Library Learning Centers.

The basic dissemination model which was developed through and systematically employed by the project is contained in the following chart. The staff of Project PRIMES feels that this chart should be considered by other Title III projects as they initially design their own dissemination strategy.

PROJECT PRIMES DISSEMINATION CHART

Audiences	Dissemination Means	Frequency of Communication
State Department of Education	Newsletters Written Reports Memos	Quarterly Quarterly As Needed
Congressmen Wiley and Devine	Letters Newsletters Packets of Information	Semi-Annually Quarterly Annually
Superintendent of Schools	Abstracts of Reports - (2 pages) Newsletters Oral Presentation at Committee-of-the-Whole Meetings Slide-Tape Show Indirect Memo Correspondence through Assistant Superintendent	Semi-Annually Quarterly Annually Annually As Needed
Cabinet Members	Abstracts of Reports (2 pages) Newsletters Oral Presentations at Committee-of-the-Whole Meetings Slide-Tape Show Memos Consultations (Person to Person)	Semi-Annually Quarterly Annually Annually As Needed As Needed
Curriculum Specialists	Consultations (Person to Person) Newsletters Curriculum Reports and Recommendations	As Needed Quarterly Annually
Elementary Principals	Slide-Tape Show Newsletters Consultations (Person to Person) Brochure Individualized School Report Information Packets System Newsletter Curriculum Report	Annually Quarterly As Needed (Minimum-Twice a Year) Annually As Needed (Twice Yearly) Annually Annually
Teachers	Slide-Tape Show (Updated Yearly) Newsletters Brochure Consultations (Person to Person) Individual School Report Curriculum Report	Annually Quarterly As Needed Annually Annually
Parents	Surveys Committee Meetings Newspaper Articles Slide-Tape Show Television Presentations Radio Programs Brochure	Annually 2-3 Times Yrly. 2-3 Times Yrly. Annually Yearly Twice Yearly

43

Project PRIMES Workshops

During the three-year tenure of the project, four highly successful system-level workshops were conducted for project participants. These workshops were jointly planned between and among various departments in the school system and included input from other agencies and organizations in the initial planning stages.

In Appendix F of this report, a complete breakdown of data regarding these workshops appears.

SECTION H. CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

The following conclusions are based upon the project objectives:

1. Project PRIMES has been successful in developing an evaluation model for use by elementary schools in assessing school programs in light of the Minimum Standards for Ohio Elementary Schools.

2. A comprehensive set of evaluation instruments for all mandated areas of the state standards has been developed.

3. A process model for developing evaluation instruments has been produced that utilizes local people and resources in instrument construction.

4. Participating schools successfully implemented the PRIMES model for evaluation.

5. Participating elementary principals' attitudes toward and knowledge of evaluation and the state standards were initially positive and were generally maintained and/or increased throughout the project tenure.

6. Based on pre and post testing, a higher percentage of Columbus elementary teachers now feel that most state standards are realistic and have meaning for their schools.

7. Generally, parents responded positively toward evaluation of elementary school programs and feel that they should be involved in the assessments.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based upon project outcomes and are written on three levels for implementation purposes.

Building Level

1. Each principal review the packaged model: Evaluating Elementary School Programs To Meet State Standards.

2. Each principal continue to assess the educational program annually.

3. Each principal document evaluation activities and have them on record for state inspection.

System Level

1. The Division of Instruction provide an annual in-service meeting during September-October dealing with the role of the principal in evaluating instructional programs.

2. The Department of Evaluation, Research and Planning produce and disseminate the packaged model: Evaluating Elementary School Programs To Meet State Standards for each elementary principal.

3. The Department of Evaluation, Research and Planning be charged with the task of monitoring the performance of elementary schools in meeting state standards.

4. The Division of Administrative Services utilize the data from local evaluations in preparing the Annual Principal's Opening Report and the State Department of Education Abstract.